

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance or into better condition for appeal.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, and the remarks that follow as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes and remarks are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1-50 are pending. Claims 1-6, 9-13 and 17-21 have been amended and claims 45-50 are newly added, without prejudice. No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the recitations in the claims is found throughout the specification.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 17, 27-36, 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Wagensonner (U.S. Patent No. 4,812,903). Applicants disagree.

For example, claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part, "A video processing method for displaying an image input as a video signal...wherein said plurality of output data correction characteristics are **selected based on an identification information inserted in said video signal to identify said image.**" (Underlining and Bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the portions of Wagensonner relied upon by the Examiner do not teach, suggest or motivate a skilled artisan to practice at least the above-recited feature of claim 1.

Wagensonner suggests characteristic functions that may curve continuously or that may be composed of a plurality of straight-line segments (column 14, lines 5-9) and Look-Up-Tables containing several of these characteristic functions, which are associated with respective brightness levels (column 15, lines 32-37). However, Wagensonner does not suggest or teach a plurality of output data correction characteristics that are selected based on an identification information inserted in said video signal to identify said image. Therefore, the instant claims are believed to be distinguishable from Wagensonner for at least the reasons stated above.

For reasons similar to those described above, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 17 are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensonner.

Claims 27-36, 39 and 40 depend from one of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 17 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensonner for at least the reasons previously described.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 17, 27-36, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wagensonner be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 37, 38 and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Wagensonner in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,134). Applicants disagree.

Claims 4, 11, 12 and 18-21 have been amended similarly to claim 1. Therefore, claims 4, 11, 12 and 18-21 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Wagensonner and Lee.

Claims 7, 8, 14-16, 37, 38 and 41-44 depend from one of claims 1, 4, 10-12 and 18-21, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensonner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Lee to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Wagensonner. Therefore, claims 7, 8, 14-16, 37, 38 and 41-44 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Wagensonner and Lee.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 37, 38 and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wagensonner and Lee be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Wagensonner in view of Lee and further in view of Kohler (U.S. Patent No. 5,615,312). Applicants disagree.

Claim 13 has been amended similarly to claim 1. Therefore, claim 13 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Wagensonner, Lee and Kohler.

Claims 22-26 depend from one of claims 1-6, 9-13 and 17-21, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Wagensonner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Lee and Kohler to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Wagensonner. Therefore, claims 22-26 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Wagensonner, Lee and Kohler.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wagensonner, Lee and Kohler be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Applicants have further added new claims 45-50. Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections relied upon by the Examiner do not apply to claims 45-50, and submit that the rejection of these claims over 35 U.S.C. 103(a) would be improper.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited documents, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, is there a basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to
Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Samuel H. Megerditchian
Reg. No. 45,678
(212) 588-0800